



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/939,239	08/24/2001	Blair D. Walker	001/017 (1-3) USA	3291

7590

10/20/2004

ARLYN L. ALONZO

Alsus Corporation

Sr. Intellectual Property Coun.

15770 Laguna Canyon Rd., Suite 150

Irvine, CA 92618

EXAMINER

DESANTO, MATTHEW F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3763

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/939,239

Applicant(s)

WALKER ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew F DeSanto

Art Unit

3763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-8, 22-34 and 39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 39 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-8 and 22-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/14/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Newly submitted claim 39 is directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

Claim 39 is distinct because it is drawn to a process while claims 5-8, 22-34 are drawn to the apparatus. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus can be used to aspirate fluid from the lungs.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 39 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 5-8, 22-27, 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Williams et al. (USPN 4,941,475).

Williams et al. discloses a venous line catheter with at least one elongate structure for establishing central venous access, wherein the catheter has a distal and proximal end and a lumen in communication with the exterior of the elongated structure at said proximal and distal portions, and at least one heat exchange element and a pump (Figures 1, 3, 7 and entire reference).

Williams et al. further discloses wherein the heat exchange element is made of urethane, nylon, PE or PET, and the heat exchange is a balloon (Figures 1, 3, 7 and entire reference).

4. Claims 5-8, and 22-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bresnahan et al. (USPN 6,117,105).

Bresnahan et al. discloses a venous line catheter with at least one elongate structure for establishing central venous access, wherein the catheter has a distal and proximal end and a lumen in communication with the exterior of the elongated structure at said proximal and distal portions, and at least one heat exchange element and a pump (Figures 14, 30 and entire reference).

Bresnahan further discloses wherein the heat exchange element is made of urethane, nylon, PE or PET, and the heat exchange is a plurality of balloons (Figures 14, 30 and entire reference).

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 8/4/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

6. With regards to paragraph 3, 7 of the remarks the applicant is arguing intended use and functional language. Any catheter has the ability to be used as a venous catheter. With regards to 7, the examiner takes the stances that the pump is capable of establishing a fluid flow within the range that is claimed. The pump range is well known in the medical art when performing a treatment. A reference can be supplied if need be to show evidence of this statement.

7. With regards to claim 5, there is no limitation in the claim that describes salt being left on or in the catheter. The examiner expects that applicant is reading limitations in form the specification.

8. With regards to the Bresnaham reference the applicant must overcome the filing date of the provisional application. The response to the rejection is improper. A declaration must be filed in order to swear behind a reference.

9. Lastly with regards to the making this rejection final and the omission of claim 39 from the last office, the examiner did not receive the preliminary amendment before the office action was completed and therefore claim 39 was not considered. Since claim 39 is restricted out, and since the grounds of rejection has not changed this office action is final. If claim 39 had caused a new ground of rejection, then this office action would be a second non-final, but since claim 39 has been withdrawn the grounds for the rejection are the same, and thus this action is made final.

***Conclusion***

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew F DeSanto whose telephone number is 1-703-305-3292. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick LUCCHESI can be reached on (703) 308-2698. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3763

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Matthew DeSanto  
Art Unit 3763  
October 18, 2004.



NICHOLAS D. LUCCHESI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700